



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/748,359

12/30/2003

Valery M. Dubin

110348-135103

7770

31817

7590

06/20/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT

PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900

1211 S.W. FIFTH AVE.

PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

QUACH, TUAN N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,359

Applicant(s)

DUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan Quach

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


Tuan Quach
Primary Examiner

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 5, 2006 has been entered.

This application presents a claim for subject matter not originally claimed or embraced in the statement of the invention. See the limitations regarding the bottom portion isolated from a conductive channel disposed on a bottom surface of the dielectric layer as now claimed in claim 1 lines 5-6 in claim 21 line 7-8. A supplemental oath or declaration is required under 37 CFR 1.67. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Claims 1-8 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation regarding "having a bottom portion isolated from a conductive channel disposed on a bottom surface of the dielectric layer" is not described in the

Art Unit: 2826

original disclosure. The original disclosure fails to characterize such isolation as well as any conductive channel as claimed. Fig. 8 does not show any isolation from any conductive channel as now alleged by applicant. See additionally Fig. 9, wherein step 206 simply corresponds to generate a damascene interconnect structure but provides no support whatever regarding the isolation to a conductive channel now alleged.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "at least substantially complete" is indefinite. The degree of completeness encompassed in this phrase is not characterized in any manner in the specification.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2826

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe in view of Aoyama or Chen.

Marathe (6,476,498) teaches regarding claim 1, a semiconductor device comprising a substrate 216, a dielectric layer 212/210 over the substrate, a damascene interconnect structure 232/234/236 defined in the dielectric layer, a barrier layer 232 deposited over the dielectric layer and within the damascene interconnect structure, the barrier layer within the damascene interconnect structure being tapered. See column 6 lines 60-68, Fig. 3. Regarding claim 2, the barrier being thinner toward an edge and thicker toward the bottom is also shown, e.g., portion 231. Regarding claim 3, the via or trench is shown in the openings in dielectric layer. Regarding claim 5, the different barrier materials. Thus Marathe lacks anticipation primarily in that it does not explicitly recite the damascene interconnect structure having a bottom portion not coupled to or isolated from a conductive channel.

Aoyama (5,592,024) teaches formation of interconnect wherein a bottom portion can either contact a lower interconnect trench or does not contact or is isolated from a lower interconnect trench. See e.g., Figs. 11G, 13D, 16, 21, 24E, 25E, 26D, 30, 31L, the corresponding descriptions including column 12, lines 46-49 wherein wiring buried in interlayer insulating film 2 is advantageously obtained for a multilayer structure, column 13 line 13-37 wherein a buried wiring is obtained, column 14 line 62, column 17 lines 20-24 wherein a wiring groove can be obtained without connecting to a lower

Art Unit: 2826

interconnect trench, column 19 lines 65 to form wiring groove 106, column 20 lines 52 et seq. wherein a wiring groove 128 is formed with the a bottom portion not contacting a lower conductive trench and wiring groove 123 contacting lower conductive trench 124, and column 21 lines 33 et seq. wherein wiring grooves having bottom portion not contacting or isolated from a conductive trench is also shown.

Chen (6,806,184) teaches opening in dielectric 22 which may an opening created as part of a damascene process and may therefore have the cross section of a singly or a double damascene opening, etched into the surface of the first layer 22 of the dielectric for the creation of an interconnection therein. A single damascene opening comprises an interconnect via or an interconnect trench, a double damascene opening comprises an interconnect via and an interconnect trench. See column 3 lines 34-54. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in practicing Marathe to have employed the damascene structure therein having bottom portions over a conductive trench as well as having bottom portion not contacting or isolated from a conductive trench in the underlying dielectric layer, since such would permit the desired conventional structures as shown in Aoyama and Chen and permits contact to the lower trench where desired and permits isolation where contact to a lower trench is not necessary, and such would permit both types of interconnect structures to be obtained using the same layers. The recitation of a tapered profile adapted to resist overhang formation and achieve at least substantially complete gap filling of the damascene interconnect structure" corresponds to recitation that an element is adapted to perform or "is capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the

Art Unit: 2826

ability to so perform. The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable. *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). It remains apparent from Marathe, e.g., Fig. 3, that there is apparent or significant substantially complete gap filling, and wherein no significant or substantial overhang formation is apparent and wherein complete gap filling is shown.

The use of cap layer is well known in the art, e.g., as evidenced by Aoyama, cap 7 over the interconnect for providing protection, see, e.g., column 11 line 20 to column 12 line 22 and such provision to protect the interconnect would have been obvious.

Regarding applicant's argument that Marathe discloses damascene structure coupled to a conductive channel and while applicant claims not coupled to a conductive channel and now claimed isolated from a conductive channel disposed on a bottom surface of the dielectric layer, such limitation is not required in Marathe which nowhere requires the exclusion of coupling to conductive channel. Applicant's recitation regarding not coupled to a conductive channel, and now amended to be isolated from a conductive channel disposed on a bottom surface of the dielectric layer, further is not associated with any explicit disclosure or any advantages; see the original disclosure [0018], [0019], wherein the dielectric layer 104 may be on any suitable layer including a metallization stack and recites nothing about isolation from conductive channel disposed on a bottom surface of the dielectric layer. Note the absence of any explicit exclusion over a conductive channel now claimed or any advantages associated therewith, which applicant has failed to point out. See additionally, instant disclosure [0023] wherein any type of damascene interconnect can be made in dielectric layer,

there is completely absence of any non-coupling to a conductive channel as now alleged or any associated alleged advantages and upon which patentability is sought. Applicant alleges that instant Fig. 8 supports its invention but fails to say what about Fig. 8 that supports the invention. Furthermore, the employment of the damascene structure in Marathe having bottom portions over a conductive trench as well as having bottom portion not contacting a conductive trench, since such would permit the desired conventional structures as shown in Aoyama and Chen and permits contact to the lower trench where desired and permits isolation where contact to a lower trench is not necessary, and such would permit both types of interconnect structures to be obtained using the same layers, inasmuch as applicant's own original disclosure fails to explicitly show such exclusion of coupling to a conductive channel and in fact evidences that such exclusion is nowhere required and no additional advantages is shown.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe taken with Aoyama or Chen as applied to claims 1-5 and 8 above, and further in view of Farrar.

The references as applied above do not recite all the materials in claim 5, thicknesses in claims 6 and 7, the silicon oxide in claim 8.

Farrar 2002/0024150 teaches the various barrier materials including refractory materials including the selection of appropriate materials, the appropriate thickness for the barrier, and the conventional dielectric such as oxide. See [0051].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have employed the well known alternative barrier materials, to have selected and optimized the appropriate

Art Unit: 2826

thickness and to have employed silicon oxide as dielectric material, as claimed in these claims since such correspond to well known materials and dimensions as evidenced by Farrar. Official notice is further given regarding well known alternative barrier materials not expressly recited.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe taken with Aoyama or Chen (as applied to claims 1-5 and 8 above), and further in view of Farrar and McCown.

The references are applied as above and does not recite the application for connection to microprocessors as in claim 21. Farrar above is applied as above and further teaches conventional application of damascene interconnect for connecting to microprocessors including the bus 452, the microprocessors. See [0066] and Fig. 24. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in practicing the above invention to have applied the interconnect in question into microprocessor interconnection since such is conventional and advantageous applications as evidenced by Farrar. Conversely, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have provided in Farrar the tapered barrier as taught by Marathe to obtain the advantages cited, column 5 lines 53-65, including the provision where a bottom portion not contacting or isolated from a lower conductive trench if desired or where such contact is unnecessary or necessary as evidenced by Aoyama or Chen. It would have been further obvious to provide the connection to a network interface since such is well known and obvious as evidenced by McCown 2002/0184490, [0025] wherein microprocessor 200B communicates through device bus 202B and network interface 206B. The recitation of

Art Unit: 2826

a tapered profile adapted to resist overhang formation and achieve at least substantially complete gap filling of the damascene interconnect structure” corresponds to recitation that an element is adapted to perform or “is capable of” performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable. *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). It remains apparent from Marathe, e.g., Fig. 3, that there is apparent or significant substantially complete gap filling, and wherein no significant or substantial overhang formation is apparent and wherein complete gap filling is shown. Regarding claim 22-24, these correspond to claims 2-4, respectively, and would have been obvious for the same reasons as delineated above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tuan Quach whose telephone number is 571-272-1717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Nathan Flynn, can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/748,359

Page 10

Art Unit: 2826

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan Quach
Primary Examiner